TTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 150199

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

nventor(s):

JAN 1 3 2005

Leonard Lap Tat Kee

**Confirmation No.:** 

5117

**Application No.:** 

10/685,595

Examiner:

B.M. Johnson

Filing Date:

October 16, 2003

**Group Art Unit:** 

3634

Title:

Sir:

FABRIC DECORATIVE ASSEMBLY AND METHOD OF USE THEREOF

Mail Stop Amendment **Commissioner for Patents** P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Transmi	Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:													
☐ Ne	sponse/Amendment w fee as calculated below additional fee							Petition to extend time to respond Supplemental Declaration						
⊠ Ot	Other: RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT								(fee \$)					
CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY														
(1) FOR	i	(2) AIMS REMAINING TER AMENDMENT		(3) MBER (TRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FO			(5) PRESENT EXTRA		(6) RATE		(7) ADDITIONAL FEES		
TOTAL CLAIMS	25		MINUS		25			=	0	Х	\$50	\$	0	
INDEP. CLAIMS	6		MINUS		6			=	2	x	\$200	\$	0	
[ ]	FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM									+	\$360	\$	0	
EXTENSION 1ST MO		1ST MONTH	1	2ND	MONTH	3RD MONTH		$\Box$		TH MONTH		\$	0	

Please charge \$0.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-2849 to cover the above fees. In the event any difference exists between the amount authorized to be charged and the actual charges, please charge or credit any such difference to Deposit Account No. 50-2849.

\$1,020,00

TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT

\$450.00

**ANDREWS KURTH LLP** 

FEE

Intellectual Property Department 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

\$120.00

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

Telephone No.: (202) 662-2700 Facsimile No.: (202) 662-2739

Respectfully submitted,

\$1,590.00

OTHER FEES

\$

\$

0

0

Sumeet Magoon

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 43,769

Date: January 13, 2005

- Attach as First Page to Transmitted Papers -

JAN 1 3 2005 B

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Appl. No.** : 10/685,595

**Applicant**: Leonard Lap Tat Kee

Filed : October 16, 2003

Title : FABRIC DECORATIVE ASSEMBLY AND METHOD OF USE

· THEREOF

TC/A.U. : 3634

**Examiner**: Johnson, Blair M.

**Docket No.** : 150199

Customer No. : 38598

## **Mail Stop Amendment**

Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

### RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Sir:

This *Response and Election* is filed, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.143 and § 1.146, in reply to the Election of Species Requirement mailed by the Patent & Trademark Office on December 14, 2004.

Claims 1-25 (original) are pending in the current application. The Office Action states that the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Figs. 1A-C; Figs. 2A-C; Figs. 3A-C; Figs. 4A-C; and Fig. 5.

Applicant traverses the restriction requirement.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not provide reasons and/or examples to support the conclusion that the application contains claims directed to the listed species as required by the MPEP. See MPEP § 803. The MPEP guidelines state that for the

purpose of the initial requirement related to a restriction (a generic term that includes election

of species as stated in MPEP § 802.02) requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be

prima facie shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate

classification, or separate status in the art, or different field of search. See MPEP § 803.

Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to meet its burden. The Office Action merely

lists the alleged distinct species and requires Applicants to make an election. The Office

Action offers no explanation in support of the separate species classification as required by

the MPEP.

Applicant believes that search and examination of the entire application can be made

without serious burden on the Patent Office. Applicant submits that the application contains

a reasonable number of species that can be examined together without serious burden on the

Patent Office. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the election of species

requirement and requests examination of the current application on the merits.

Below, Applicant has grouped the claims and identified the species the claims read

on. Also, Applicant makes a provisional election based on the below groupings. Based on

Applicant's analysis:

• Group 1 includes claims 1-5, 8, 12-15 and 21-24 that read on Figs. 1A-1C and

Figs. 3A-3C;

Group 2 includes claims 1-8, 11-16 and 21-24 that read on Figs. 2A-2C;

• Group 3 includes claims 1-5, 8, 11-12, 14-15 and 21-24 that read on Figs. 4A-

4C; and

• Group 4 includes claims 1-3, 8-10 and 17-25 that read on Fig. 5.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's grouping of the claims,

Applicant requests that the Examiner provide alternative grouping of the claims.

- 2 -

WAS:109947.1

Appl. No. 10/685,595

Response dated January 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2004

Based on the above groupings, Applicant provisionally elects Group 2 that includes claims 1-8, 11-16 and 21-24 that read on Figs. 2A-2C, for examination.

Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the remaining claims by filing one or more divisional applications.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests examination of the current application on the merits and submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2005

Sumeet Magoon

Registration No. 43,769

**Andrews Kurth LLP** 

1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

Tel. (202) 662-2700

Fax (202) 662-2739